



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Expecting the Unexpected: How discourse expectations can reverse predictability effects in reading time

Citation for published version:

Futrell, R & Rohde, H 2012, 'Expecting the Unexpected: How discourse expectations can reverse predictability effects in reading time', CUNY 2012, New York, United States, 14/03/12 - 16/03/12. <<http://cuny2012.commonsgc.cuny.edu/>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Futrell, R., & Rohde, H. (2012). Expecting the Unexpected: How discourse expectations can reverse predictability effects in reading time. Poster session presented at CUNY 2012, New York, United States.


General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Expecting the Unexpected: How discourse expectations can reverse predictability effects in reading time

Richard Futrell^a & Hannah Rohde^b
Stanford University^a, University of Edinburgh^b
contact: futrell@stanford.edu



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

THE PROBLEM

Sentences are easiest to process when words that listeners encounter are **frequent or predictable given surrounding linguistic context** (Kliegl et al., 2004; Levy, 2008; among many others). However, hearers also expect discourse to convey **informative**, and therefore **unpredictable**, information (Grice, 1975; Shannon, 1948).

We investigate whether the **expectation of informativity** can:

- (1) Make unpredictable words easier to process,
- (2) Make **highly predictable words hard to process**, because they are **anomalously underinformative**.

THE EXPERIMENT

In a self-paced reading time study, we modulate readers' expectations about the surprisingness of upcoming material in a discourse.

- We describe an individual as either **boring** or **surprising**.
- Then we describe them using **predictable** or **unpredictable** instruments for some task (Brown & Dell, 1987).

Condition	Predicted reading times
Don't expect surprise	Predictable < Unpredictable
Expect surprise	Unpredictable < Predictable

Stimuli were presented using **Ibex** over **Mechanical Turk**. 110 subjects saw 4 target sentences each. Words were centered on the screen.

We did not analyze data from subjects who:

- (1) Were not located in the United States,
- (2) Did not answer every comprehension question correctly, or
- (3) Had a mean reading time greater than 2 s.d. above or below the overall mean.




Figure 1: Expecting surprise. The word *knife* is unpredictable from previous context, but it is in line with the expectation of surprise.




Figure 2: Anomalous underinformativity. The word *knife* is highly predictable from previous context—which conflicts with the discourse expectation.

Low-informativity expectation:

My classmate John is a boring person who always does things the way you'd expect.

a. locally predictable instrument ["don't expect surprise, don't get surprise"]

For instance, in order to chop some carrots, he was using a knife yesterday in the afternoon.

b. locally unpredictable instrument ["don't expect surprise but get surprise"]

For instance, in order to brush his teeth, he was using a knife yesterday in the afternoon.

THE RESULTS




Figure 3. Reading times at the critical instrument and following words.

For reading times at **the final word**, we find the expected effect. When readers expect surprise, the **expected instrument is slower** than the **unexpected instrument**.

The interaction of local predictability and discourse expectation is significant by ANOVA ($F(1,102) = 11.286, p = 0.001$; $F(1,12) = 7.535, p = 0.018$) and in a mixed-effects model with subject and item as random intercepts ($p < 0.001$).

CONCLUSIONS

- To our knowledge these new findings are the first evidence of comprehension difficulty for material that is overly predictable from local cues.
- The results point to the importance of modeling comprehenders' pragmatic expectations about upcoming material—namely, their expectations about relevance and informativity.
- We are currently examining whether the same effects hold using **conventional linguistic markers of informativity**, such as **clefts**, and using adjuncts other than instruments.

THANKS & WORKS CITED

Thanks to **Philip Hofmeister**, **Dan Jurafsky**, and **Tom Wasow** for much advice! We are indebted to **Alex Drummond** for creating Ibex, and **Klinton Bicknell** for providing the scripts used to analyze data.

- Kliegl, R., Grabner, E., Rolfs, M., & Engbert, R. 2004. Length, frequency, and predictability effects of words on eye movements in reading. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 16: 262-284.
- Levy, R. 2008. Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition* 106(3):1126-1177.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In D. Davidson and G. Harman (eds), *The Logic of Grammar*. 64-75.
- Shannon, C.E. 1948. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, July 1948: 623.
- Brown, P., & Dell, G. S. 1987. Adapting production to comprehension: The explicit mention of instruments. *Cognitive Psychology* 19: 441-472.